arXiv:1404.3700v1 [cond-mat.supr-con] 14 Apr 2014

Evolution of the superconducting energy gap structure concomitant with Fermi surface reconstruction in the heavy-fermion superconductor $CeCoIn_5$

Hyunsoo Kim,[1] M. A. Tanatar,[1] R. Flint,[1] C. Petrovic,[2] Rongwei Hu,[2,*] B. D. White,[3] I. K. Lum,[3] M. B. Maple,[3] and R. Prozorov[1,†]

[1] *Ames Laboratory and Department of Physics & Astronomy, Iowa State University, IA 50011, USA*
[2] *Department of Physics, Brookhaven National Laboratory, Upton, New York 11973, USA*
[3] *Department of Physics, University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, California 92093, USA*

(Dated: 14 April 2014)

The London penetration depth, $\lambda(T)$ was measured in single crystals of $Ce_{1-x}R_xCoIn_5$, R=La, Nd and Yb down to 50 mK ($T_c/T \sim$50) using a tunnel-diode resonator. In the cleanest samples $\Delta\lambda(T)$ is best described by the power law, $\Delta\lambda(T) \propto T^n$, with $n \sim 1$, consistent with line nodes. Substitutions of Ce with La, Nd and Yb lead to similar monotonic suppressions of T_c, however the effects on $\Delta\lambda(T)$ differ. While La and Nd doping results in an increase of the exponent to $n \sim 2$, as expected for a dirty nodal superconductor, Yb doping leads to $n > 3$, inconsistent with nodes, suggesting a change from nodal to nodeless superconductivity where Fermi surface topology changes were reported, implying that the nodal structure and Fermi surface topology are closely linked.

PACS numbers: 74.70.Tx,72.15.Eb,74.20.Rp

Magnetically mediated pairing is widely believed to be responsible for unconventional superconductivity found in materials ranging from the high-T_c cuprates to the iron-based superconductors[1] to heavy fermion compounds[2–4]. For a long time, this unconventional superconductivity was thought to always be nodal, with a d-wave superconducting energy gap symmetry. While unconventional pairing does require a sign changing gap, nodal lines are not actually required, and many iron-based superconductors have an $s_\pm$ gap structure, where any nodes are merely accidental. Recently there have been some suggestions of fully gapped[5] or $s_\pm$ [6, 7] superconductivity in heavy fermion materials. In this paper, we use penetration depth studies to show that nodes in the superconducting energy gap of pure $CeCoIn_5$ can be *removed* by substituting Yb for Ce, revealing the first clear example of a nodeless heavy fer mion superconductor.

The heavy fermion superconductor $CeCoIn_5$ has one of the highest transition temperatures in its class, T_c=2.3 K [8] and reveals quantum criticality when tuned by either pressure [9] or field [10–12]. The criticality is thought to be due to magnetic fluctuations, making it an intriguing material in which to study the relationship between magnetism, quantum criticality and the superconducting energy gap structure. Several experimental studies have shown unconventional properties consistent with the presence of line nodes in the superconducting energy gap [13–16]. Thermal conductivity and heat capacity measurements as a function of magnetic field direction [17, 18] are interpreted [19] as evidence for a $d_{x^2-y^2}$ gap. This interpretation finds support in directional point contact spectroscopy [20] and k-space resolved quasiparticle interference scanning tunneling microscopy (STM) measurements [21, 22], as well as the spin resonance found at a three-dimensional (π,π,π) wavevector [23].

However, none of these measurements are phase sensitive and thus can only demonstrate the presence and perhaps positions of line nodes, not their origin and symmetry. Indeed, several observations are difficult to reconcile with the $d-$wave scenario. Most importantly, despite very low residual resistivity ρ_0=0.2$\mu\Omega$cm in magnetic fields of 5 T [24], the London penetration depth of pure $CeCoIn_5$ has never shown the linear temperature dependence expected in clean d-wave superconductors. Instead, if $\lambda(T)$ is parametrized by fitting to a power-law, $\Delta\lambda(T) = AT^n$, measurements on crystals from different sources that presumably have different amounts of scattering [15, 25–27] yield a variation of the exponent n between 1.5 and 2, where $n = 2$ represents the dirty limit in the gapless regime for any pairing symmetry [28]. Similar conclusions about the presence of a large density of unconde nsed quasi-particles over an extremely broad temperature and field range were made from doping-dependent thermal conductivity studies [29–31]. The origin of this unusual superfluid response in a very clean material remains unclear, and several suggestions were put forward, including non-local electrodynamics[26] and a temperature dependent quasi-particle mass enhancement within the superconductor due to a nearby QCP [27, 32]. Deviations from a simple d-wave scenario have stimulated discussions of alternative models in which the Fermi surface topology plays an important role in the superconducting pairing in the 115s[6, 7], motivated by recent ideas put forward for iron-based superconductors [33, 34].

To gain an insight into this unusual superfluid response of $CeCoIn_5$, in this letter we report a systematic study of the London penetration depth in single crystals of $CeCoIn_5$, with Ce substituted by both magnetic and non-magnetic rare-earth ions: La, Nd and Yb. These three dopants affect the parent material differently: La acts as

a non-magnetic impurity; excess f-electrons on Nd ions remain localized and induces long range magnetic order in compositions $x \geq 0.05$, with $T_N < Tc$ [35, 36]; and Yb substitution provides hole doping, leading to a change in the Fermi surface topology [37, 38].

We find that the evolution of the low - temperature variation of the London penetration depth with La and Nd substitutions is consistent with the presence of line-nodes, while its evolution with the Yb substitution suggests a nodal to nodeless transformation of the superconducting energy gap structure concomitant with the Fermi surface topology change, a challenge for the conventional d-wave picture of magnetically mediated pairing.

Single crystals of $Ce_{1-x}R_xCoIn_5$ (R=La, Nd, Yb) were grown using In flux method [35, 39–41]. The values of x were in the range of $0 < x < 0.05$ for R=La and Nd and $0 < x < 0.20$ for Yb. Samples for in-plane London penetration depth measurements were cut and polished into rectangular parallelepipeds with typical dimensions $\sim 0.6 \times 0.6 \times 0.1$ mm^3 ($a \times b \times c$). Details of the TDR measurements of London penetration depth in a dilution refrigerator and their analysis can be found elsewhere [42–44].

Figure 1 shows the temperature-dependent normalized rf magnetic susceptibility of the samples used in this study over the whole superconducting range from base temperature to T_c. In all cases, chemical substitution suppresses T_c, with $T_c(x)$ in good quantitative agreement with previous studies [35, 39–41] as shown in Fig. 1 (d)-(f). The transitions remain sharp even in doped samples, suggesting homogeneous dopant distribution.

In Fig. 2 we show the temperature-dependent London penetration depth in a range close to T_c in three nominally pure samples of $CeCoIn_5$, S1, S2 and S3. For reference we show measurements made in slightly Yb doped sample, x=0.01, with all measurements taken in identical conditions in the same setup and using the same thermometry. This comparison clearly shows that the T_c of nominally pure samples varies by as much as 0.1 K, reflecting hidden disorder/chemical contamination. Not unexpectedly, the temperature dependence of the London penetration depth, taken in the lowest temperature limit, changes with T_c. Fitting data with a power-law function, $\Delta\lambda(T) = AT^n$, we find that n sensitively depends on minute variation of sample T_c, as shown in the inset of Fig. 2. In the highest T_c sample (S1), the exponent n =1.25 is below 1.5 and close to 1, as expected for superconductors with line nodes in the clean limit. We u se the data for this sample for reference in the following. For sample S3 and the Yb-doped sample (x=0.01) the exponent is significantly higher, tending toward n=2. Both n close to 1 and its tendency towards n=2 with disorder are in line with expectation for nodal superconductors. For example, in the d-wave case confirmed by phase-sensitive experiments in cuprates [45] and strongly suggested but not confirmed in $CeCoIn_5$ [17–22], the dependence is expected to be T-linear in the clean limit and T^2 in the dirty limit [46]. The dependence at intermediate dopings is described by $\Delta\lambda(T) = At^2/(t^* + t)$ where t^* is a crossover temperature scale determined by unitary-limit impurity scattering and $t \equiv T/T_c$. The change of exponent is unexpectedly steep with T_c, suggesting that the effect of disorder is not insignificant in nominally pure $CeCoIn_5$, and might be responsible for the unusual exponents found in previous studies.



FIG. 1. (Color online) Left row panels (a) to (c) show the temperature-dependence of normalized rf magnetic susceptibility of $Ce_{1-x}R_xCoIn_5$ for R=La (top panel (a), x=0, 0.02 and 0.05 right to left), R=Nd (middle panel (b), x=0, 0.02 and 0.05 right to left) and x= Yb (bottom panel (c), x=0, 0.01, 0.1 and 0.2, right to left). Right row panels (d) to (f) show $T_c(x)$ as determined in our measurements (red solid dots) in comparison with the literature data for $Ce_{1-x}La_xCoIn_5$ (panel (d), data from Petrovic *et al.* [39]), $Ce_{1-x}Nd_xCoIn_5$ (panel (e), data from Petrovic *et al.* [35]) and $Ce_{1-x}Yb_xCoIn_5$ (panel (f), blue squares are data from Capan *et al.* [40] and black triangles are data from Shu *et al.* [41]).

In Fig. 3 we summarize the evolution of the temperature-dependent London penetration depth in $Ce_{1-x}R_xCoIn_5$ (R =La, Nd, Yb). In panel (a) we show data for R=La, data for Nd; Yb substitutions are shown in panel (b). The data are plotted versus a normalized temperature scale $(T/T_c)^2$. For reference we include pure $CeCoIn_5$, S1. As expected, the pure material shows downward curvature consistent with n <2. Doping with both La and Nd suppresses T_c by as much as 0.5 K and



FIG. 2. Temperature dependence of London penetration depth in three nominally pure samples of $CeCoIn_5$ (S1, S2, and S3) and in a slightly Yb doped sample x=0.01. Note that S3 of the nominally pure $CeCoIn_5$ has T_c lower than the Yb-doped sample. The exponent n, describing the temperature dependence of the London penetration depth as $\Delta\lambda(T) = AT^n$ strongly depends on T_c, tending to n=1 in the best samples.

0.9 K respectively (see Fig. 1) and rapidly changes the power law exponent n to 2 for x=0.05, as expected for line-node superconductors. On the other hand, the evolution of the temperature-dependent London penetration depth with Yb doping is unique. The sample with x=0.2 demonstrates clear saturation at low temperatures, consistent with n >2, which cannot be explained in the nodal scenario. The increase of the exponent $n > 2$ can also be clearly seen in samples with x=0.1.

As $CeCoIn_5$ is a multi-gap system[31], we must be careful in our analysis. In single gap s-wave and d-wave superconductors, the characteristic behavior of $\Delta\lambda(T)$ is observed for temperatures $T < T_c/3$, where the temperature dependence of the gap $\Delta(T)$ can be neglected. This assumption is not valid for multi-band systems, in which the smallest of the gaps can be strongly temperature-dependent down to temperatures $T < 0.3T_c$. Since the range over which the smaller gap can be considered as constant is not known *a priori*, it is important to vary the range of the power-law fitting. We adopted a procedure in which the high temperature end of the fitting interval, T_{up}, was varied and the exponent n of the power-law fit was plotted as a function of T_{up}, as shown in panel (c) of Fig. 3. Several conclusions can be drawn from the inspection of $n(T_{up})$ and its evolution with Yb doping. The dependence in samples with x=0.1 and x=0.2 shows that the data are inconsistent with the existence of nodes in the superconducting energy gap for any temperature range selection, as for all T_{up}, $n > 2$, the highest value possible in superconductors with line nodes. Moreover, the exponent in the highest doped sample attains values which are technically indistinguishable from the exponential behavior observed in full gap superconductors [44]. Hence, we conclude that the superconducting energy gap in $CeCoIn_5$ undergoes a topological transition from nodal to nodeless with Yb-substitution.

We summarize our study of doping evolution of London penetration depth and T_c in rare earth substituted $CeCoIn_5$ in Fig. 4. We plot the exponent of the power-law analysis of London penetration depth as a function of T_c, with dopant concentration as a hidden parameter. This type of plot avoids uncertainty in the concentration of La, Nd and Yb substitutions. In particular, the rate of depression of T_c with x for Yb substituted flux grown singe crystals [41] such as those studied here is only about one third of that found in thin film specimens [47]. The origin of this difference is currently under investigation.

This study shows that Yb substitution significantly changes the structure of the superconducting energy gap in $CeCoIn_5$. Comparison to La and Nd substitutions suggests that this effect is not due to pairbreaking impurities or to doping-induced magnetism. Instead, we conclude that the hole-doping effect of Yb substitution, and the resulting change in electronic structure is the important factor. It is thus natural to link the change of the superconducting energy gap structure to a change in Fermi surface topology, and indeed recent de Haas-van Alphen studies find significant changes of the Fermi surface with Yb substitution, including the disappearance of the intermediately heavy α sheet between $x = 0.1$ and 0.2[37, 38], exactly where we find that the gap nodes vanish.

STM studies of $CeCoIn_5$ [21] indicate that the α Fermi surface sheet plays a key role in superconductivity. A change in the gap structure with its disappearance seems plausible, as the spectrum of magnetic fluctuations may change dramatically. However, two features in our data are difficult to reconcile with this scenario. First, T_c evolves smoothly during the gap structure transformation, seemingly completely insensitive to the Fermi surface topology change. Second, if the Fermi surface structure determines the gap structure, a symmetry-imposed d-wave gap is difficult to understand.

The iron-based superconductors have similar changes in superconducting energy gap structure: in hole-doped KFe_2As_2, a change in gap structure with pressure is indicated by a non-monotonic $T_c(P)$ dependence [48], and similar changes with doping have been suggested in $Ba_{1-x}K_xFe_2As_2$ [49]. The gap structure of iron pnictides is frequently discussed in terms of Fermi surface nesting favoring magnetically mediated pairing, and similar ideas have been discussed for the 115s[6, 7]. However, in both iron-based examples, T_c varies non-monotonically through the change, as one would expect for nesting dependent pairing, while in Yb doped $CeCoIn_5$, T_c barely notices the change in gap structure, suggesting that the Fermi surface may not play an important role here.



FIG. 3. Temperature-dependent London penetration depth of (a) La-, Nd- and (b) Yb-substituted substituted $CeCoIn_5$, plotted vs a normalized $(T/T_c)^2$ scale. The dependence in pure material S1 shows a clear downturn consistent with $n = 1.2 < 2$. The data for La-and Nd-doped samples closely follow a T^2 dependence, expected in dirty nodal superconductors for all doping levels. In Yb-substituted samples, there is a clear crossover from sub-linear to super-linear, suggesting a rapid increase of the exponent n, and $n > 2$ for samples with x=0.1 and 0.2. (c) Floating fitting range analysis in pure and Yb-substituted $CeCoIn_5$ samples. The data were fit using a power-law function over the temperature range from base temperature to a temperature $T_{up} < T_c/3$, and the resultant exponent n was plotted as a function of T_{up}.



FIG. 4. The average exponent of the power-law dependence of London penetration depth as a function of superconducting transition temperature for La substitution (black circles), Nd substitution (blue triangles) and Yb substitution (red squares). The values are obtained by the averaging of the exponent obtained from the range fitting, see Fig. 3(c).

One alternate scenario is that the superconducting energy gap symmetry remains d-wave through $x = 0.2$, but the underlying Fermi surface disappears - in this sense, the nodes in pure $CeCoIn_5$ are accidental. Indeed, hole-doping should remove the α sheet seen in STM[21]. However, the removal of the Fermi surface sheet with the largest gap is problematic for magnetically mediated pairing theories.

Composite pairing provides an alternate scenario[50]. Here, superconductivity arises from cooperative Kondo screening, where two electrons screen the same local moment to form a composite pair[51]. This process is local and does not require an underlying Fermi surface, allowing the Yb doping to tune the underlying heavy Fermi liquid toward a Kondo insulator without affecting the pairing. The low energy excitations are uncondensed mobile composite pairs expected to have a $\Delta\lambda \sim T^4$ temperature dependence, consistent with our data for $x = 0.2$.

In conclusion, by performing systematic measurements of the London penetration depth in $Ce_{1-x}R_xCoIn_5$, R=La, Nd and Yb, we find an anomalous change of the superconducting energy gap structure in Yb - doped compounds from nodal to nodeless linked with the Fermi surface topology change for $x = 0.2$.

We thank P. Coleman and O. Erten for stimulating discussions and sharing their theoretical work prior to publication. The work in Ames was supported by the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE), Office of Science, Basic Energy Sciences, Materials Science and Engineering Division. Ames Laboratory is operated for the U.S. DOE by Iowa State University under contract No. DE-AC02-07CH11358. Part of the work was carried out at the Brookhaven National Laboratory, which is operated for the US Department of Energy by Brookhaven Science

Associates (DE-Ac02-98CH10886). Research at UCSD was supported by the U. S. DOE under Grant No. DE-FG02-04ER46105. H. K. acknowledges the support from AFOSR-MURI grant No. FA9550-09-1-0603.

* Present address: Rutgers Center for Emergent Materials and Department of Physics and Astronomy, Rutgers University, Piscataway, New Jersey 08854, USA.
† Corresponding author: prozorov@ameslab.gov

[1] M. R. Norman, Science **332**, 196 (2011).
[2] N. D. Mathur, F. M. Grosche, S. R. Julian, I. R. Walker, D. M. Freye, R. K. W. Haselwimmer, and G. G. Lonzarich, Nature **394**, 39 (1998).
[3] P. Monthoux, D. Pines, G. G. Lonzarich, Nature **450**, 1177 (2007).
[4] J. D. Thompson and Z. Fisk, J. Phys. Soc. Jpn **81**, 011002 (2012).
[5] S. Kittaka, Y. Aoki, Y. Shimura, T. Sakakibara, S. Seiro, C. Geibel, F. Steglich, H. Ikeda, and K. Machida, Phys. Rev. Lett. **112**, 067002 (2014).
[6] F. Ronning, Jian-Xin Zhu, Tanmoy Das, M. J. Graf, R. C. Albers, Hahnbidt Rhee, W. E. Pickett, J. Phys.: Condens. Matter **24**, 294206 (2012).
[7] Tanmoy Das, J.-X. Zhu, Matthias J. Graf, arXiv:1311.6410
[8] C. Petrovic, P. G. Pagliuso, M. F. Hundley, R. Movshovich, J. L. Sarrao, J. D. Thompson, Z. Fisk, an P. Monthoux, J. Phys. Condens. Matter **13**, L337 (2001).
[9] V. A. Sidorov *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **89**, 157004 (2002).
[10] J. Paglione *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **91**, 246405 (2003).
[11] A. Bianchi *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **91**, 257001 (2003).
[12] M. A.Tanatar, J. Paglione, C. Petrovic, and L. Taillefer, Science **316**, 1320 (2007).
[13] Y. Kohori, Y. Yamato, Y. Iwamoto, T. Kohara, E. D. Bauer, M. B. Maple, J. L. Sarrao, , Phys. Rev. B **64**, 134526 (2001).
[14] R. Movshovich, M. Jaime, J. D. Thompson, C. Petrovic, Z. Fisk, P. G. Pagliuso, and J. L. Sarrao, , Phys. Rev. Lett. **86**, 5152 (2001).
[15] S. Özcan, D. M. Broun, B. Morgan, R. K. W. Haselwimmer, J. L. Sarrao, S. Kamal, C. P. Bidinosti, P. J. Turner, M. Raudsepp, and J. R. Waldram, Europhys. Lett., **62** 412 (2003)
[16] P. M. C. Rourke, M. . Tanatar, C. S. Turel, J. Berdeklis, C. Petrovic, and J. Y. T. Wei, Phys. Rev. Lett. **94**, 107005 (2005).
[17] K. Izawa, H. Yamaguchi, Y. Matsuda, H. Shishido, R. Settai, and Y. Onuki, Phys. Rev. Lett. **87**, 057002 (2001).
[18] H. Aoki, T. Sakakibara, H. Shishido, R. Settai, Y. Onuki, P. Miranovic, and K. Machida, J. Phys. Condens. Matter **16**, L13 (2004).
[19] A. Vorontsov and I. Vekhter, Phys. Rev. Lett. **96**, 237001 (2006).
[20] W. K. Park, J. L. Sarrao, J. D. Thompson, and L. H. Greene, Phys. Rev. Lett. **100**, 177001 (2008).
[21] M. P. Allan, F. Massee, D. K. Morr, J. van Dyke, A.W. Rost, A. P. Mackenzie, C. Petrovic, and J. C. Davis, Nature Physics **9**, 468 (2013)
[22] Brian B. Zhou, Shashank Misra, Eduardo H. da Silva Neto, Pegor Aynajian, Ryan E. Baumbach, J. D. Thompson, Eric D. Bauer, and Ali Yazdani, Nature Physics **9**, 682 (2013)
[23] C. Stock, C. Broholm, J. Hudis, H. J. Kang, and C. Petrovic, Phys. Rev. Lett. **100**, 087001 (2008).
[24] Johnpierre Paglione, M. A. Tanatar, D. G. Hawthorn, F. Ronning, R. W. Hill, M. Sutherland, Louis Taillefer, and C. Petrovic, Phys. Rev. Lett. 97, 106606 (2006).
[25] R. J. Ormeno, A. Sibley, and Colin E. Gough, S. Sebastian, and I. R. Fisher, Phys. Rev. Lett. **88**, 047005 (2002).
[26] E. M. Chia, D. J. Van Harlingen, M. B. Salamon, B. D. Yanoff, I. Bonalde, and J. L. Sarrao, Phys. Rev. B, **67**, 014527 (2003).
[27] K. Hashimoto, Y. Mizukami, R. Katsumata, H. Shishido, M. Yamashita, H. Ikeda, Y. Matsuda, J. A. Schlueter, J. D. Fletcher, A. Carrington, D. Gnida, D. Kaczorowski, and T. Shibauchi, Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA **110**, 3293-3297 (2013).
[28] V. G. Kogan, R. Prozorov, and C. Petrovic J. Phys.: Condens. Matter **21**, 102204 (2009).
[29] M. A. Tanatar, Johnpierre Paglione, S. Nakatsuji, D. G. Hawthorn, E. Boaknin, R. W. Hill, F. Ronning, M. Sutherland, Louis Taillefer, C. Petrovic, P. C. Canfield, and Z. Fisk, Phys. Rev. Lett. **95**, 067002 (2005).
[30] V. Barzykin and L. P. Gor'kov, Phys. Rev. Lett.**98**, 087004 (2007).
[31] G. Seyfarth, J. P. Brison, G. Knebel, D. Aoki, G. Lapertot, and J. Flouquet, Phys. Rev. Lett. **101**, 046401 (2008).
[32] C. J. S. Truncik, W. A. Huttema, P. J. Turner, S. Özcan,, N. C. Murphy, P. R. Carrire, E. Thewalt, K. J. Morse, A. J. Koenig, J. L. Sarrao, and D. M. Broun Nature Communications **4**, 2477 (2013).
[33] I. I. Mazin, Nature **464**, 183 (2010).
[34] A. Chubukov, Ann. Rev. Cond. Matt.Phys **3**, 57 (2012).
[35] Rongwei Hu, Y. Lee, J. Hudis, V. F. Mitrovic, and C. Petrovic Phys. Rev. B **77**, 165129 (2008).
[36] S. Raymond, S. M. Ramos, D. Aoki, G. Knebel, V. Mineev, and G. Lapertot, J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. **83**, 013707 (2014).
[37] A. Polyakov, O. Ignatchik, B. Bergk, K. Gtze, A. D. Bianchi, S. Blackburn, B. Provost, G. Seyfarth, M. Ct, D. Hurt, C. Capan, Z. Fisk, R. G. Goodrich, I. Sheikin, Manuel Richter, and J. Wosnitza, Phys. Rev. B **85**, 245119 (2012).
[38] L. Dudy, J. D. Denlinger, L. Shu, M. Janoschek, J. W. Allen, and M. B. Maple, Phys. Rev. B **88**, 165118 (2013
[39] C. Petrovic, S. L. Bud'ko, V. G. Kogan, and P. C. Canfield Phys. Rev. B **66**, 054534 (2002).
[40] C. Capan, G. Seyfarth, D. Hurt, B. Prevost, S. Roorda, A. D. Bianchi, and Z. Fisk, Europhys. Lett. **92**, 47004 (2010).
[41] L. Shu, R. E. Baumbach, M. Janoschek, E. Gonzales, K. Huang, T. A. Sayles, J. Paglione, J. O'Brien, J. J. Hamlin, D. A. Zocco, P.-C. Ho, C. A. McElroy, and M. B. Maple, Phys. Rev. Lett. **106**, 156403 (2011).
[42] H. Kim, N. H. Sung, B. K. Cho, M. A. Tanatar, and R. Prozorov, Phys. Rev. B**87**, 094515 (2013).
[43] R. Prozorov, R. W. Giannetta, A. Carrington, and F. M. Araujo-Moreira, Phys. Rev. B **62**, 115 (2000).
[44] R. Prozorov and R. W. Giannetta, Supercond. Sci.

Techn. **19**, R41 (2006).
[45] C. C. Tsuei and J. R. Kirtley, Rev. Mod. Phys. **72**, 969 (2000).
[46] P. J. Hirschfeld and N. Goldenfeld, Phys. Rev. B **48**, 4219 (1993).
[47] M. Shimozawa, T. Watashige, S. Yasumoto, Y. Mizukami, M. Nakamura, H. Shishido, S. K. Goh, T. Terashima, T. Shibauchi, and Y. Matsuda, Phys. Rev. B **86**, 144526 (2012).
[48] F. F. Tafti, A. Juneau-Fecteau, M.-E. Delage, S. Rene de Cotret, J.-P. Reid, A. F. Wang, X.-G. Luo, X. H. Chen, N. Doiron-Leyraud, and L. Taillefer, Nat. Phys. **9**, 349 (2013).
[49] J.-P. Reid, A. Juneau-Fecteau, R. T. Gordon, S. R. de Cotret, N. Doiron-Leyraud, X. G. Luo, H. Shakeripour, J. Chang, M. A. Tanatar, H. Kim, R. Prozorov, T. Saito, H. Fukazawa, Y. Kohori, K. Kihou, C. H. Lee, A. Iyo, H. Eisaki, B. Shen, H.-H. Wen, and L. Taillefer, Supercond. Sci.Techn. **25**, 084013 (2012).
[50] O. Erten and P. Coleman, arXiv:1402.7361 (2014).
[51] P. Coleman, A. M. Tsvelik, N. Andrei. and H. Y. Kee, Phys. Rev. B **60**, 3608 (1999).
[52] T. Hu, Y.P. Singh,L. Shu,M. Janoschek, M. Dzero, M.B. Maple, and C. Almasan, PNAS **110**, 7160 (2013).